



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/069,480	02/27/2002	Kazuyuki Miya	L9289.02130	3434
24257	7590	03/18/2008	EXAMINER	
DICKINSON WRIGHT PLLC			ISMAIL, SHAWKI SAIF	
1901 L STREET NW				
SUITE 800			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20036			2155	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/18/2008	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/069,480	MIYA ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	SHAWKI S. ISMAIL	2155

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 15 February 2008 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because
- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
 - (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
 - (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
 - (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: NONE.

Claim(s) objected to: NONE.

Claim(s) rejected: 38-50.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: NONE.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.
12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____
13. Other: _____.

/saleh najjar/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2155

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant argues that Mohebbi does not disclose the claimed invention. The examiner respectfully disagrees. Applicant argues on page 2 of applicant's remarks that the claimed subject matter supports synchronizing the transmit order of packets among base stations and providing the base stations with a packet scheduling function. The applicant further argues on page 3 of the remarks that claimed subject matter distributes the packet scheduling functionality among a plurality of base stations.

In response to applicant's argument that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (synchronizing the transmit order of packets among base stations, providing the base stations with a packet scheduling function and/or distributing the packet scheduling functionality among a plurality of base stations) are not positively recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Mohebbi teaches Subsequently, Mohebbi discloses a mobile station that is capable of receiving a downlink signal from each of a plurality of base stations. The mobile station produces a measure of signal quality of the downlink signals from the plurality of base stations to the mobile station and selects a base station from which the downlink signal shows a preferred signal quality. The mobile station transmits an uplink signal indicating the selected base station among the plurality of base stations for subsequent communications with the mobile station (see abstract). The selected base station transmits the next frame according to information received from the mobile terminal such as ACK/NAK in order to transmit the correct fame number to the mobile station. The claims as currently presented merely recite "transmit order information specifying a packet transmit order" and does not specify what the order information comprises and how it is accomplished as such it has been broadly interpreted to the ACK/NAK that a mobile station transmits to identify whether it received a frame or not and therefore Mohenni meets the scope of the claimed invention. It is advised that, in order to further expedite the prosecution of this application and overcome the cited prior art, applicant should amend the base claims to describe in more narrow detail the true distinguishing features of applicant's claimed invention specifically enabling synchronization among base stations and providing the base stations with the packet scheduling functionality in the context of fast packet transmission as disclosed in the specification.